

### Remarks

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Office Action dated August 7, 2007. Claims 1, 8 and 13 have been amended. Therefore, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this case. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested, particularly in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0006163A1 by Hibi et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0115111 to Malone et al. Claims 1, 8 and 13 have been amended. Support for these amendments is inherent to the application as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a "security system comprising: a video mobile phone . . . automatically transmitting alarm control signals and alarm video frames . . . over a cellular telephone network; an alarm generator in cellular signal communication with the video mobile phone for receiving the alarm control signals from the video mobile phone over the cellular telephone network and generating an alarm; and an alarm video storage device in cellular signal communication with the video mobile phone for receiving over the cellular telephone network and storing the alarm video frames transmitted from the video mobile phone."

The published application of Hibi et al. is generally directed towards a conventional security system using a conventional camera and related components.

The video data of Hibi et al. is uncompressed and unsuitable for transmission over a cellular telephone network.

The published application of Malone et al. is generally directed towards a cellular camera phone that lacks an automatic security function. That is, the cellular camera portion is manually controlled by a user, and any transmission of image data is also manually controlled by the user. In addition, the cellular telephone network of Malone et al. has neither an alarm generator in cellular signal communication with the phone nor an alarm video storage device in cellular signal communication with the phone.

Therefore, Hibi et al. in view of Malone et al. fail to teach or suggest at least “a video mobile phone . . . automatically transmitting alarm control signals and alarm video frames . . . over a cellular telephone network”, “an alarm generator in cellular signal communication with the video mobile phone” and/or “an alarm video storage device in cellular signal communication with the video mobile phone”, each as recited in amended Claim 1.

Amended Claims 8 and 13 recite comparable subject matter. Accordingly, amended Claims 1, 8 and 13 are neither taught nor suggested by Hibi et al. in view of Malone et al., whether taken alone or in combination with any of the other references of record in this case.

### Conclusion

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 13 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above. Since the remaining claims each depend from one of the above claims and necessarily include each of the elements and limitations thereof, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated, as well as for reciting additional patentable subject matter. Thus, each of Claims 1-20 is in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, reconsideration of the rejections and an early and favorable allowance of this case are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by:



Eric M. Parham  
Registration No. 45,747  
Attorney for Applicant

### Correspondence Address:

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
Telephone: (516) 692-8888  
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889